

GN



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/331,763	06/25/1999	KAZUTO NISHIDA	177/526327	2049

7590 11/29/2002

WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK
2033 K STREET NW
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MEREK, JOSEPH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/331,763

Applicant(s)

NISHIDA, KAZUTO

Examiner

Joseph C. Merek

Art Unit

3727

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 18.
10. ☐ Other: _____

LEE YOUNG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejections with respect to Murakami by itself and in combination with Tsukagoshi et al are maintained. Applicant argues that it was their intent to define the term solid in the specification as non-liquid. The examiner request applicant to specifically show where this definition is found in the disclosure. Solid has as one of its broadest definitions as not being without internal cavity. The disclosure does not define the term or its meaning. Moreover Tsukagoshi et al, as seen in Col. 12, lines 7-11, specifically states that the connection composition can be in the form a liquid or a solid. Tsukagoshi et al also discloses using an connection material that is attached to a peelable film. This connection material cannot be in liquid form for this to work. The examiner has taken the position that in the reference to Murakami will inherently correct for warping of the circuit board and the electronic component. The instant invention discloses that it is the pressing force of greater than 20gf that cure the warping of the board and component. Murakami uses a force that is greater than 20gf. The correction is therefore inherent. The new matter rejection regarding the softening of the circuit board is maintained. The declaration filed 11/18/02 does not cure the lack of disclosure in the specification. This declaration does not make reference to where this information is located in the disclosure. The argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the circuit board is softened does not cure the lack of disclosure. Moreover, it appears that this was a fatal omission of what is really required to perform the function of the correction of the warping of the circuit board. The new matter rejection regarding claims 77, 80, and 83 is maintained. The specification does not tie together the activities of hardening the resin the leveling the bumps with the correcting of the warping of the electronic component. The specification supports the correction of the warping of the electronic component occurring with that of the board since it is the application of a pressure that is greater than 20gf.